

healthcare providers intended to limit abortion access.

In Nevada and across the country, the vast majority of voters believes that women should get to make their own decisions about their reproductive health, including when and whether to have a child. We cannot let a dedicated minority take that right away from the rest of us.

Let me just say, I am going to keep working on this issue because it is so important to Nevadans and to women all over this country. This is about making sure that women can control their own bodies and their futures, and I will always stand up for that.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON ANDERSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired on the Anderson nomination.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Anderson nomination?

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 393 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Hagerty	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeben	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Burr	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Portman	Young
Grassley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Crapo	Moran
--------	-------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is con-

sidered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

REDUCE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to talk a moment about my REDUCE Act, which is the act to reduce plastic pollution, of which we have a lot.

Humans have created 8 billion tons of plastic, and it is all over the place. It is in our water. It is in our rivers. It is in our food. The Presiding Officer is from Colorado. As he knows, there was a study done that tested the rain falling in Colorado that showed that there were microplastics in the raindrops in Colorado.

So we have a plastics problem, and this is a bill whose intention is to solve that plastics problem.

I want to have you think about three numbers while I am making this speech: 2 percent, 10 percent, and 2050; 2 percent, 10 percent, and 2050.

What is 2 percent? Two percent is how much recycled plastic the plastics industry uses in single-use, disposable, throwaway plastic.

We had a hearing in the Environment and Public Works Committee, led by Chairman CARPER. We had witnesses in who were experts. They said it is actually less than 2 percent. So the plastics industry is comfortable with a business model in which they are only using recycled plastic for less than 2 percent of their production of single-use, disposable stuff.

They will then say: Well, yeah, but we don't need to worry about that because then it goes into the recycling bin.

Well, first of all, that is not much help if you are only going to use 2 percent recycled plastic in your plastic manufacturing and then 98 percent is all new fossil fuel-based plastic.

But here we get to the second number, 10 percent. When you put plastic in that blue bin and send it out to be recycled, less than 10 percent of that plastic actually gets recycled. Some people have said 6 percent. Some people have said 8 percent. Some people have said 9 percent. But pretty much everybody agrees that less than 10 percent of what you put in the recycling bin to recycle ever gets recycled. And the plastics industry is cool with that too.

The plastics industry is cool with 2 percent recycling content in their throughput, in their supply, and they are comfortable with 90 percent or more of your recycled plastics sent out in the blue bins never being recycled.

This brings me to the third number, 2050. Twenty-fifty is the year which, on present trends, will produce the following state of affairs: There will be more waste plastic floating in the Earth's oceans by mass than there will be living fish. That is the trajectory we are on with an industry that is totally content to use only 2 percent recycled plastic in its production and to have

the recycling system recycle less than 10 percent of the plastic that goes in. That is where we end up by 2050. And if we are content in this room to confer on our children and grandchildren a world in which there is more waste plastic floating around than there is living fish, then shame on us.

This is a trajectory we have to change, and my bill will change it. But, of course, the plastic industry doesn't love this. They are happy with using only 2 percent recycled plastic in their production. They are happy with less than 10 percent of recycled plastic in the blue bin ever getting recycled. They don't seem to give a red hot damn about the trajectory we are on with where we are going to be with waste plastic in the oceans. But they obviously care a lot about the bill because if you lived in Washington, DC, and you got the Washington Post on Wednesday, September 22, you got this little gem tucked in your newspaper on the front. It is a very glossy, multicolored handout, and it says:

Stop the plastic tax. Keep everyday goods affordable.

And then it shows a whole bunch of everyday goods: a bicycle helmet, reusable plastic containers that you use in your refrigerator to put stuff away when you are putting it back in the fridge, sneakers, a plastic child's toy, and a baby diaper.

Not one of those things is covered by our plastics tax—not one of them—not personal hygiene products like a diaper and not multiuse products like a child's toy or a sneaker or a bicycle helmet or the plastic containers that you store stuff in in your refrigerator.

If you flip it over, they go at it even further. There is a child's baby seat. There is solar paneling. There is a toothbrush. There is a cellphone. And there is a little package of tomatoes in Saran wrap in one of those foam Styrofoam containers.

The one thing on this whole page that this plastics pollution fee would touch is that disposable bit of foam. And if you would rather have that in the ocean instead of being recycled, fine; vote against this bill. But if you would like to see that kind of junk get properly disposed of, you need to support the act.

So why do you think the industry got this so wrong? Bicycle helmets, children's toys, car seats, toothbrushes? Do you think they actually didn't know what was in the bill or is it possible that they are just lying about the bill? And what conclusion do you draw when an industry is lying about a piece of legislation? The conclusion that I draw is that they know they would lose if they argued on the truth, and so they lie.

And they spent a lot of money on this. This is, you know, glossy. This is multicolor. We in politics, we send out mailers. This is not inexpensive. You put this onto every Washington Post—that is a big deal. They flooded the DC metropolitan area with this glossy pack of lies.